UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/721,471	11/26/2003	Daniel K. Tor	ASH03009	8133

25537 7590 02/05/2010

VERIZON
PATENT MANAGEMENT GROUP
1320 North Court House Road
9th Floor
ARLINGTON, VA 22201-2909

EXAMINER	
CARDENAS NAVIA, JAIME F	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
3624	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/05/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@verizon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/721,471	TOR ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jaime Cardenas-Navia	3624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 August 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Introduction

1. This **FINAL** office action is in response to communications received on August 27, 2009. Claims 1, 7, 13, 18, and 20 have been amended. Claims 1-20 are currently pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered by the Examiner. In particular, Applicant argues that:

(A) regarding independent claims 1, 7, 13, 18, and 20, none of the applied references teach or suggest the newly claimed subject matter; and

(B) all dependent claims are allowable as a result of (A).

Regarding argument (A), Examiner respectfully disagrees. First, Examiner would like to note that there is an important implied fact in the newly amended claims: that the 'one of the plurality of potential visitors' *has* the information necessary to send a registration request for each of the plurality of potential visitors named in the visitation request. Without this crucial fact, the process as claimed cannot be carried out.

This implied fact is not mentioned in Applicant's specification, leading Examiner to conclude that the steps necessary for 'one of the plurality of visitors' to have the required registration information for the plurality of potential visitors is old and well-known. And surely, it is old and well-known for a first party to provide a second party with pertinent and potentially private information necessary for registration. So if 'one of the plurality of potential visitors' has

the required registration information for the other potential visitors, which is an implied fact that can be arrived at through old and well-known methods, then of course they can register the other potential visitors.

Thus, as Nguyen teaches inviting a plurality of potential visitors, each of which is named in a request, and it is old and well-known for one party to register another party (as implied by Applicant's specification), the newly amended independent claims do not overcome the prior art. New grounds of rejection necessitated by amendment are presented below.

Regarding argument (B), Examiner respectfully disagrees, as per the response above.

Official Notice

3. The Examiner would like to note the requirements for traversing official notice from MPEP § 2144.03:

> To adequately traverse such a finding, an applicant must specifically point out the supposed errors in the examiner's action, which would include stating why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art. See 37 CFR 1.111(b).
>
> If applicant does not traverse the examiner's assertion of official notice or applicant's traverse is not adequate, the examiner should clearly indicate in the next Office action that the common knowledge or well-known in the art statement is taken to be admitted prior art because applicant either failed to traverse the examiner's assertion of official notice or that the traverse was inadequate [emphasis added].

Because Applicant has not specifically pointed out any errors in the Examiner's action, the officially noticed facts in the previous office action are deemed admitted prior art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1-5 and 7-11 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Lue Chee Lip et al. (US 2002/0099794 A1) in view of Nguyen et al. (US 7,523,385 B2) and Official Notice.

Regarding claim 1, Lue Chee Lip teaches a visitation system comprising:

means for receiving a visitation request from a person (par. 28);

means for determining whether the visitation request from the person is approved or disapproved (par. 29); and

means for communicating the approval or disapproval of the visitation request (par. 31).

Lue Chee Lip does not expressly teach:

means for receiving a visitation request from a person for a plurality of potential visitors to attend the same visitation, each of said visitors being named in said request by said inmate;

means for sending from one of the plurality of potential visitors a registration request for each of the plurality of potential visitors based upon the received visitation request;

means for receiving registration information based upon the sent registration request.

Nguyen teaches:

means for receiving a visitation request from a person for a plurality of potential visitors to attend the same visitation, each of said visitors being named in said request by said inmate (col. 12, 13, visitors invited to event registration);

means for receiving registration information based upon the sent registration request (col. 12, 13, registration received over internet, phone, etc.) in an analogous art of event scheduling.

The inventions of Lue Chee Lip and Nguyen pertain to scheduling events for pre-selected and pre-approved visitors. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Nguyen does not teach away from or contradict Lue Chee Lip, but rather, teaches an alternative system for achieving a very similar result. Additionally, the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the teaching of Lue Chee Lip on the flexibility of the invention for accommodating specific business needs (par. 35).

Neither Lue Chee Lip nor Nguyen explicitly teach:

means for sending from one of the plurality of potential visitors a registration request for each of the plurality of potential visitors based upon the received visitation request; and

that the intended use of the system is limited to scheduling inmates as claimed.

Official Notice is given that it is old and well-known for one party to register another party (as implied by Applicant's specification); and

Official notice is given that scheduling visitations with inmates is old and well known wherein correction facilities, as a common practice, control and manage who can visit inmates and when those visitations can occur.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that the visitation system as taught by the combination of Lue Chee Lip and Nguyen would have been used to schedule any of a plurality of visitation types, including but not limited to inmate visitations, in view of the teachings of official notice; the resultant system enabling correction facilities to control who can visit inmates and when those visitations can occur.

Further it is noted that the intended field of use of the visitation system merely represent non-functional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited nor do they alter the recited structural elements. By applicant's own admission, the visitation system is not necessarily intended solely for inmates in a corrections facility environment (par. 16). The recited method steps would be performed the same regardless of the intended field of use of the visitation system/method. Further, the structural elements remain the same regardless of the specific intended field of use of the visitation system/method. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994); MPEP 2106.

Regarding claim 2, Lue Chee Lip teaches means for recording information associated with one or more of the visitation request, the registration request and the visitation approval or disapproval (par. 70, par. 135, par. 140).

Regarding claim 3, Lue Chee Lip teaches wherein the means for determining is at least

one of a security administrator and an analytical process that reviews at least one of historical visitation requests and visitation data (par. 33, a security administrator is the equivalent of a prison official, and whether or not classified material is going to be discussed is visitation data).

Neither Lue Chee Lip nor Nguyen expressly teach that the intended use of the system is limited to scheduling inmates as claimed.

Official notice is given that scheduling visitations with inmates is old and well known wherein correction facilities, as a common practice, control and manage who can visit inmates and when those visitations can occur.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that the visitation system as taught by the combination of Lue Chee Lip and Nguyen would have been used to schedule any of a plurality of visitation types, including but not limited to inmate visitations, in view of the teachings of official notice; the resultant system enabling correction facilities to control who can visit inmates and when those visitations can occur.

Further it is noted that the intended field of use of the visitation system merely represent non-functional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited nor do they alter the recited structural elements. By applicant's own admission, the visitation system is not necessarily intended solely for inmates in a corrections facility environment (par. 16). The recited method steps would be performed the same regardless of the intended field of use of the visitation system/method. Further, the structural elements remain the same regardless of the specific intended field of use of the visitation system/method. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see In re

Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994); MPEP 2106..

Regarding claim 4, Lue Chee Lip teaches wherein the means for recording further maintains a history of potential visitors requested by a person (par. 31, par. 70, visitor database and visitor directory).

Neither Lue Chee Lip nor Nguyen expressly teach that the intended use of the system is limited to scheduling inmates as claimed.

Official notice is given that scheduling visitations with inmates is old and well known wherein correction facilities, as a common practice, control and manage who can visit inmates and when those visitations can occur.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that the visitation system as taught by the combination of Lue Chee Lip and Nguyen would have been used to schedule any of a plurality of visitation types, including but not limited to inmate visitations, in view of the teachings of official notice; the resultant system enabling correction facilities to control who can visit inmates and when those visitations can occur.

Further it is noted that the intended field of use of the visitation system merely represent non-functional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited nor do they alter the recited structural elements. By applicant's own admission, the visitation system is not necessarily intended solely for inmates in a corrections facility environment (par. 16). The recited method steps would be performed the same regardless of the intended field of use of the visitation system/method. Further, the structural elements remain the same regardless of the specific intended field of use of the visitation system/method. Thus, this descriptive material

will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994); MPEP 2106..

Regarding claim 5, Lue Chee Lip teaches wherein the visitation request includes at least one of a name (par. 124), address, telephone number and relationship to the inmate of at least one of the plurality of potential visitors.

Regarding claims 7-11, they are rejected using the same art and rationale used above for rejecting claims 1-5. This is because claims 7-11 claim a method performing the steps carried out by the system of claims 1-5.

6. **Claims 6 and 12 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lue Chee Lip et al. (US 2002/0099794 A1) in view of Nguyen (US 7,523,385 B2) as applied to claims 1-5 and 7-11 above, further in view of Williams (US 2004/0243435).

Regarding claim 6, neither Lue Chee Lip nor Nguyen teach means for scheduling, for approved ones of the potential visitors, an available time to visit the inmate.

Williams teaches means for scheduling, for approved ones of the potential visitors, an available time to visit the inmate (par. 24).

The inventions of Lue Chee Lip, Nguyen, and Williams pertain to registering in a sytem and scheduling appointments. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Williams does not teach away from or contradict Lue Chee Lip or Nguyen, but rather, teaches a function that was not addressed. Additionally, the

combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the advantage of having scheduled times for the visit so that scheduling conflicts can be minimized.

Regarding claim 12, it is rejected using the same art and rationale used above for rejecting claim 6. This is because claim 12 claims a method performing the steps carried out by the system of claim 6.

7. **Claims 13-17 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lue Chee Lip et al. (US 2002/0099794 A1) in view of Nguyen (US 7,523,385 B2), Williams (US 2004/0243435), and Official Notice.

Regarding claim 13, Lue Chee Lip teaches a computer program product including computer-readable program code for use in a computer, said computer-readable program code comprising:

visitation registration program code for receiving a visitation request from a person, automatically approving or disapproving a registration request for each of the plurality of potential visitors based upon the visitation request and recording information associated with at least one of the visitation request and the registration request (par. 28, 29, and 31).

Lue Chee Lip does not expressly teach:

visitation registration program code for receiving a visitation request from a person for a plurality of potential visitors to attend the same visitation, each of said visitors being named in said request by said inmate;

the registration request sent from one of the plurality of potential visitors for each of the plurality of potential visitors based upon the visitation request; and

visitation scheduling program code for scheduling, for approved ones of the potential visitors, an available time to visit the person.

Nguyen teaches visitation registration program code for receiving a visitation request from a person for a plurality of potential visitors to attend the same visitation, each of said visitors being named in said request by said inmate (col. 12, 13, event registration sent to a plurality of potential visitors, user can register themselves, guests, and other participants).

The inventions of Lue Chee Lip and Nguyen pertain to scheduling visits of pre-selected and pre-approved visitors. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Nguyen does not teach away from or contradict Lue Chee Lip, but rather, teaches an alternative system for achieving a very similar result. Additionally, the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the teaching of Lue Chee Lip on the flexibility of the invention for accommodating specific business needs (par. 35).

Williams teaches a visitation scheduling program code for scheduling, for approved ones of the potential visitors, an available time to visit the person (par. 24).

The inventions of Lue Chee Lip, Nguyen, and Williams pertain to registering in a sytem and scheduling appointments. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no

change in their respective functions, as Williams does not teach away from or contradict Lue Chee Lip or Nguyen, but rather, teaches a function that was not addressed. Additionally, the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the advantage of having scheduled times for the visit so that scheduling conflicts can be minimized, which is a well-known and common scheduling goal.

Neither Lue Chee Lip, Nguyen, nor Williams expressly teach that the intended use of the system is limited to scheduling inmates as claimed.

Official Notice is given that it is old and well-known for one party to register another party (as implied by Applicant's specification).

Official notice is given that scheduling visitations with inmates is old and well known wherein correction facilities, as a common practice, control and manage who can visit inmates and when those visitations can occur.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that the visitation system as taught by the combination of Lue Chee Lip, Nguyen, and Williams would have been used to schedule any of a plurality of visitation types, including but not limited to inmate visitations, in view of the teachings of official notice; the resultant system enabling correction facilities to control who can visit inmates and when those visitations can occur.

Further it is noted that the intended field of use of the visitation system merely represent non-functional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited nor do they alter the recited structural elements. By applicant's own admission, the visitation system is not necessarily intended solely for inmates in a corrections facility environment (par. 16). The

recited method steps would be performed the same regardless of the intended field of use of the visitation system/method. Further, the structural elements remain the same regardless of the specific intended field of use of the visitation system/method. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994); MPEP 2106..

Regarding claim 14, Lue Chee Lip does not teach wherein the visitation scheduling program code is accessed by an approved potential visitor.

Williams teaches wherein the visitation scheduling program code is accessed by an approved potential visitor (par. 24).

The inventions of Lue Chee Lip, Nguyen, and Williams pertain to registering in a system and scheduling appointments. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Williams does not teach away from or contradict Lue Chee Lip or Nguyen, but rather, teaches a function that was not addressed. Additionally, the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the advantage of a potential visitor being able to view, modify, and cancel appointments taught by Williams (par. 24).

Regarding claim 15, Lue Chee Lip teaches wherein the visitation registration program code further comprises communicating disapproval of the registration request in response to the registration request (par. 31).

Regarding claim 16, Lue Chee Lip teaches wherein the visitation registration program code further allows the plurality of potential visitors to access a status of the registration request (par. 61).

Regarding claim 17, Lue Chee Lip teaches wherein if additional information is needed the visitation registration program code further places the registration request on hold pending the additional information (par. 61).

8. **Claims 18-20 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nguyen (US 7,523,385 B2) in view of Lue Chee Lip et al. (US 2002/0099794 A1), Williams (US 2004/0243435), and Official Notice.

Regarding claim 18, Nguyen teaches an automated method to register and schedule a plurality of potential visitors in a given timeslot for a visit (col. 12, 13):

receiving names of the plurality of potential visitors from the inmate in order to schedule the visit with the person, the request being received by one of the plurality of potential visitors (col. 12, 13, event registration sent to a plurality of potential visitors);

supplying the requested registration information to a sender of the request (col. 12, 13, event registration through internet, phone, etc.).

Nguyen does not explicitly teach:

along with a request to provide registration information of all said potential visitors;

receiving an approval notification;

accessing a visitation schedule to enter a proposed visiting time corresponding to the given timeslot to schedule the visit with the person;

determining whether the person is available at the proposed visiting time; and

if the person is available during the proposed visiting time, receiving a schedule and confirmation number.

Lue Chee Lip teaches:

receiving an approval notification (par. 31).

The inventions of Nguyen and Lue Chee Lip pertain to scheduling visits of pre-selected and pre-approved visitors. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Lue Chee Lip does not teach away from or contradict Nguyen, but rather, teaches an alternative method for achieving a very similar result. Additionally, the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the teaching of Lue Chee Lip on the flexibility of the invention for accommodating specific business needs (par. 35).

Williams teaches:

accessing a visitation schedule to enter a proposed visiting time corresponding to the given timeslot to schedule the visit with the person (par. 23, par. 24);

determining whether the person is available at the proposed visiting time (par. 42, lines 12-15, an appointment would not be scheduled for a time that was not available); and

if the person is available during the proposed visiting time (par. 42, lines 12-15), receiving a schedule (par. 23, line 4).

The inventions of Nguyen, Lue Chee Lip, and Williams pertain to registering in a system and scheduling appointments. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Williams does not teach away from or contradict either Nguyen or Lue Chee Lip, but rather, teaches a function that was not addressed. Additionally, the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the advantage of hosting events without scheduling conflicts.

Official Notice is given that it is old and well-known for one party to register another party (as implied by Applicant's specification).

Official notice is given that receiving a confirmation number was a matter of common knowledge to one skilled in the art at the time of applicant's invention. Websites, fast-food restaurants, dentist offices, etc. provide confirmation numbers for transactions, including the scheduling of appointments.

Official notice is given that scheduling visitations with inmates is old and well known wherein correction facilities, as a common practice, control and manage who can visit inmates and when those visitations can occur.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that the visitation system as taught by the combination of Nguyen, Lue Chee Lip, and Williams would have been used to schedule any of a plurality of visitation types, including but not limited to inmate visitations, in view of the teachings of official notice; the resultant system enabling correction facilities to control who can visit inmates and when those visitations can occur.

Further it is noted that the intended field of use of the visitation system merely represent non-functional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited nor do they alter the recited structural elements. By applicant's own admission, the visitation system is not necessarily intended solely for inmates in a corrections facility environment (par. 16). The recited method steps would be performed the same regardless of the intended field of use of the visitation system/method. Further, the structural elements remain the same regardless of the specific intended field of use of the visitation system/method. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994); MPEP 2106..

Regarding claim 19, Nguyen teaches wherein the request is based upon a visitation request supplied by the person (col. 12, 13, event registration supplied by host).

Neither Nguyen, Lue Chee Lip, nor Williams expressly teach that the intended use of the system is limited to scheduling inmates as claimed.

Official notice is given that scheduling visitations with inmates is old and well known wherein correction facilities, as a common practice, control and manage who can visit inmates and when those visitations can occur.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that the visitation system as taught by the combination of Nguyen, Lue Chee Lip, and Williams would have been used to schedule any of a plurality of visitation types, including but not limited to inmate visitations, in view of the teachings of official notice; the resultant system enabling correction facilities to control who can visit inmates and when those visitations can occur.

Further it is noted that the intended field of use of the visitation system merely represent non-functional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited nor do they alter the recited structural elements. By applicant's own admission, the visitation system is not necessarily intended solely for inmates in a corrections facility environment (par. 16). The recited method steps would be performed the same regardless of the intended field of use of the visitation system/method. Further, the structural elements remain the same regardless of the specific intended field of use of the visitation system/method. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994); MPEP 2106..

Regarding claim 20, Nguyen teaches in a network having at least one visitor network interface linked to at least one prison network interface by way of a computer system running a visitation scheduling software module, an automated method to register and schedule a plurality of potential visitors in a same timeslot for a visit with an inmate (col. 12, 13, registration through internet, phone, etc.), the method comprising:

one of the plurality of potential visitors using the at least one visitor network interface to receive a request over the network from the at least one prison network interface, the request including names of the potential visitors supplied by said inmate and being made for registration information to schedule a visitation by the plurality of potential visitors with the inmate (col. 12, 13, event registration sent to a plurality of potential visitors);

Nguyen does not expressly teach:

receiving an approval notification;

accessing the visitation scheduling software module to schedule a visit with the inmate by entering a proposed visiting time corresponding to the given timeslot;

determining whether the inmate is available at the proposed visiting time; and

receiving a schedule and confirmation number if the inmate is available during the proposed visiting time.

Lue Chee Lip teaches:

receiving an approval notification (par. 31).

The inventions of Nguyen and Lue Chee Lip pertain to scheduling visits of pre-selected and pre-approved visitors. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Lue Chee Lip does not teach away from or contradict Nguyen, but rather, teaches an alternative method for achieving a very similar result. Additionally, the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the teaching of Lue Chee Lip on the flexibility of the invention for accommodating specific business needs (par. 35).

Williams teaches:

accessing the visitation scheduling software module to schedule a visit with the inmate by entering a proposed visiting time corresponding to the given timeslot (par. 23, 24);

determining whether the inmate is available at the proposed visiting time (par. 42, lines 12-15, and appointment would not be scheduled for a time that was not available); and

receiving a schedule if the inmate is available during the proposed visiting time (par. 23, 42).

The inventions of Nguyen, Lue Chee Lip, and Williams pertain to registering in a system and scheduling appointments. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Williams does not teach away from or contradict either Nguyen or Lue Chee Lip, but rather, teaches a function that was not addressed. Additionally, the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the advantage in fewer registration errors.

Official Notice is given that it is old and well-known for one party to register another party (as implied by Applicant's specification).

Official notice is given that receiving a confirmation number was a matter of common knowledge to one skilled in the art at the time of applicant's invention. Websites, fast-food restaurants, dentist offices, etc. provide confirmation numbers for transactions, including the scheduling of appointments.

Official notice is given that scheduling visitations with inmates is old and well known wherein correction facilities, as a common practice, control and manage who can visit inmates and when those visitations can occur.

The inventions of Nguyen, Lue Chee Lip, Williams, and official notice pertain to registering in a system and scheduling appointments. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known

methods with no change in their respective functions, as Williams does not teach away from or contradict either Nguyen or Lue Chee Lip, but rather, teaches a function that was not addressed. Additionally, the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the advantage of fewer registration errors.

Further it is noted that the intended field of use of the visitation system merely represent non-functional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited nor do they alter the recited structural elements. By applicant's own admission, the visitation system is not necessarily intended solely for inmates in a corrections facility environment (par. 16). The recited method steps would be performed the same regardless of the intended field of use of the visitation system/method. Further, the structural elements remain the same regardless of the specific intended field of use of the visitation system/method. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994); MPEP 2106..

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jaime Cardenas-Navia whose telephone number is (571)270-1525. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 10:30AM - 7:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Abdi can be reached on (571) 272-6702. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kambiz Abdi/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3684

/J. C./
Examiner, Art Unit 3624
January 30, 2010